UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,719	12/10/2001	Aleksandr O. Ryzhov	10018530-1	3647

7590   03/14/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
PESIN, BORIS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/006,719	RYZHOV, ALEKSANDR O.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Boris Pesin	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 October 2004</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 10/18/2004.

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, and 15 are independent

claims. In the Amendment A, Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 15, and 18 were amended and claims

21-24 were added as new. This action is made Non-Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-20, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated

by Kimberley Burchett "http://www.kimbly.com/code/dnd/index.html".

In regards to claim 1, Burchett teaches installing one or more keyboard and

mouse event listeners to a Java application implemented in a window, wherein the one

or more keyboard and mouse event listeners follows movements of a mouse cursor

(See Figures 1-4, there are listeners in Burchett to follow the position of the cursors as

illustrated by the source code of Burchett See Figure 5); Burchett further teaches

attaching a custom glass pane to the window of the Java application, wherein the

mouse cursor is located in the window, and displaying a drag image approximate the

mouse cursor using the custom glass pane (inherent in Burchett because all Java

JFrames have glass panes to record positions of pointers and cursors See Appendix A).

Burchett further teaches a method wherein the drag image represents the dragged

object and moves with the mouse cursor (See Figures 1-4, The image is being dragged

from one window to another window and one can see the image being dragged).

In regards to claim 2, Burchett teaches a method further comprising removing the

custom glass pane from the window after the drag and drop operation (inherent in

Burchett because the focus is moved from one window to another).

In regards to claim 3, Burchett teaches a method wherein the displaying step

includes repainting the drag image using the custom glass pane (See Figures 1-4 the

picture is repainted each time it is dragged).

In regards to claim 4, Burchett teaches method wherein the displaying step

comprises: detaching the custom glass pane from a previous window of the Java

application; and attaching the custom glass pane to a next window of the Java

application where the mouse cursor is currently located (see Figures 2 and 3, the focus

is moved from one window to another therefore moving the glass pane form one

window to another).

In regards to claim 5, Burchett teaches a method wherein the displaying step

includes using a standard drag and drop application programming interface (API)

specification (See Figures 1-4, Java API is used to create the functionality of dragging

(i.e. Java Applet window)).

In regards to claim 6, Burchett teaches a method wherein the installing step includes installing the one or more keyboard and mouse event listeners at a global application level (See Figures 1-4, This example is being run on Windows NT therefore it is inherent that the listeners are global to the operating system).

In regards to claim 7, Burchett teaches a method further comprising saving a currently installed glass pane in a storage device before attaching the custom glass pane to the window (See Figures 1-4, the states are saved each time the cursor is moved and before any clicks).

In regards to claim 8, Burchett teaches a method further comprising reattaching a previously saved glass pane to the window after removing the custom glass pane from the window after the drag and drop operation (See Figure 4, when the mouse button is let go and the dragging stops the regular glass pane is utilized to show the location of any images in the window).

In regards to claim 22, Burchett teaches a method wherein the displaying the drag image step utilizes Java library functions (See Figures 1-4, since this is done in Java for Java applications it must use Java libraries).

Claim 9 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 10 is in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is in the same context as claim 7; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is in the same context as claim 8; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is in the same context as claim 7; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 12 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is in the same context as claim 8; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 24 is in the same context as claim 22; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimberley Burchett http://www.kimbly.com/code/dnd/index.html in view of Gershony et al. (US 6549218).

In regards to claim 21, Burchett teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Burchett does not teach a method wherein the drag image is made half-transparent by changing alpha channel values for each pixel of an original image. Gershony teaches, "Some special effects, such as transparency are identified by an alpha value, which enables further programs to manipulate the window in its associated bit map to make it appear transparent." (Abstact). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Burchett with the teachings of Gershony and include a method to make the image half-transparent with the motivation to provide the user a convenient method of observing objects that are underneath the dragged image.

Claim 23 is in the same context as claim 21; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BP